

**REMARKS**

Claims 11-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for indefiniteness. In response to this rejection, each instance of “plate-like” has been replaced with -- plate --, per the Examiner’s suggestion. It is believed that these amendments overcome this rejection.

Claims 11, 12, 19 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for anticipation by either U.S. Patent No. 5,194,834 to Bacher et al. and claims 11 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for anticipation by U.S. Patent No. 2,689,294 to Weber et al. In the Detailed Action, claims 13-18, 20-27 and 29 have not been rejected on the merits. Accordingly, Applicant believes that these claims contain allowable subject matter.

In response to the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), limitations from claim 13 have been incorporated into claim 11; and claims 13 and 21 have been cancelled. After the foregoing amendments claims 11, 12, 14-20 and 22-29 are pending in the application.

As amended herein, claim 11 recites an attenuation or termination element having a coaxial structure for radio frequency electromagnetic waves, having at least one resistive part, which is positioned in an outer conductor and has at least one connection to an inner conductor part, wherein the resistive part is produced from at least two separately produced plates, wherein the plates are each provided with a central slot and are plugged together using these slots.

Assuming *arguendo* the Bacher et al. patent teaches a coaxial attenuator including a resistive part that includes a plurality of plate parts connected/fixed to the inner conductor with springs and the resistive part engages cylindrical grooves in the outer conductor, as alleged by the Examiner in the Office Action, the Bacher et al. patent does not disclose, teach or suggest an attenuation or termination element having a resistive part produced from at least two separately produced plates, wherein the plates are each provided with a central slot and are plugged together using the slots.

Similarly, assuming *arguendo* that the Weber et al. patent teaches a coaxial attenuator including a resistive part formed of two resistive plates (9') connected and fixed to the inner conductor, as alleged by the Examiner in the Office Action, the Weber et al. patent does not disclose, teach or suggest a resistive part produced from two separately produced plates wherein the plates are each provided with a central slot and are plugged together using these slots.

Application No. 10/526,292  
Paper Dated: October 30, 2006  
In Reply to USPTO Correspondence of July 31, 2006  
Attorney Docket No. 0115-050577


Absent disclosing an attenuation or termination element having all the limitations of claim 11, the Bacher et al. and Weber et al. patents, either individually or in combination, cannot anticipate or render obvious claim 11, or claims 12, 14-20 and 22-29 dependent therefrom.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of claims 11, 12, 14-20 and 22-29 are requested.

Respectfully submitted,

THE WEBB LAW FIRM

By 

William H. Logsdon  
Registration No. 22,132  
Attorney for Applicant  
700 Koppers Building  
436 Seventh Avenue  
Pittsburgh, PA 15219  
Telephone: 412-471-8815  
Facsimile: 412-471-4094  
E-mail: [webblaw@webblaw.com](mailto:webblaw@webblaw.com)